

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the final Office Action mailed December 7, 2005, in which claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1-4 and 15-17 stand rejected. Claims 5-10, 12-14, and 18 are objected to. Claims 6 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, and 18 have been amended.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent number 6,851,190 to Guimont et al., claims 1-4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent number 4,809,432 to Schauble in view of US Patent Application publication number 2004/0109793 to McNeeley, and claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schauble in view of McNeeley as applied to claim 1 and further in view of US Patent number 6,473,970 to Prochaska.

The Examiner also objected to claims 5-10, 12-14, and 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the Examiner's indication that claims 5-10, 12-14, and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, Applicants have amended claim 1 by incorporating the subject matter of claim 6 into claim 1 and have accordingly cancelled claim 6. In doing so, the phrase "a transport system" in claim 1 was replaced with "at least one osmotic pump in a substrate" from claim 6. Reference to the transport system was also removed from claim 18, which indirectly depends from claim 1, and replaced with "the shaving aid delivery system" to comport with the language of claim 1. Applicants have also amended claim 7 to correct its dependency from now-cancelled claim 6 to claim 1.


In view of the above amendments made in response to the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-4 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are believed to be moot. Applicants believe the amendment to claim 1 places the application in a condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejection thereof. As claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-18 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable, Applicants assert these claims are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request the removal of the objections to and rejections thereof.

Applicants believe that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the amended claims herein are allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections and objections be withdrawn and the present application be passed onto allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' representative would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

A check in the amount of \$120 is enclosed for the fee for the one-month extension of time. Applicants believe that no additional fees are due with the filing of the present response, however, if any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account No. 503342 maintained by Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Richard R. Michaud
Registration No. 40,088
Attorney for Applicants

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206
Middletown, CT 06457-1532
(860) 632-7200